

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
2 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - # 84065  
3 rvannest@kvn.com  
4 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - # 184325  
canderson@kvn.com  
5 DANIEL PURCELL - # 191424  
dpurcell@kvn.com  
6 633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
Telephone: (415) 391-5400  
Facsimile: (415) 397-7188

7 KING & SPALDING LLP  
8 BRUCE W. BABER (pro hac vice)  
bbaber@kslaw.com  
9 1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
Telephone: (212) 556-2100  
10 Facsimile: (212) 556-2222

11 Attorneys for Defendant  
GOOGLE INC.

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
14 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

15 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561 WHA (DMR)

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 GOOGLE INC.,

**GOOGLE INC.'S RESPONSE TO ECF  
NO. 1531**

19 Defendant.

Dept. Courtroom 8, 19<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Judge: Hon. William Alsup

Defendant Google Inc. (“Google”) hereby submits the following statement in response to the Court’s Order reflected in Docket Number 1531. In the Order, the Court asks that each side “respond to each other’s submissions regarding social media investigations of jurors” as well as address several specific “issues regarding [each side’s] search strategies (assuming, *arguendo*, that some Internet searches about prospective jurors is allowed).” ECF No. 1531 at 1.

As noted in its opening submission on this issue, Google does not object in this case to the Court’s proposal to ban Internet research on jurors, provided the ban applies equally to both sides. Nevertheless, Google addresses the Court’s further inquiries below.

## **I. GOOGLE’S RESPONSE TO ORACLE’S SUBMISSION**

Oracle’s submission on juror research recites several general legal principles with which Google agrees. For example, Google agrees that the right to an impartial jury is an important constitutional right. ECF No. 1529 at 3. Google also agrees that seeking out publicly-available information regarding prospective jurors is a well-recognized practice in federal courts. *Id.* at 4.

Oracle’s submission includes specific proposals for how Internet research on jurors should be conducted in this case. Assuming that the Court permits such research in this case, Google does not object to most of Oracle’s proposals, to the extent Google understands those proposals. Specifically, Google agrees (i) that neither party should use non-public information in its possession, custody, or control to research prospective jurors (ECF No. 1529 at 1) and (ii) that passive Internet research of publicly available information is appropriate under the guidance provided by the Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility of the American Bar Association in its 2014 Formal Opinion 466 and other bar association opinions on the issue (*id.* at 6).

Google notes that Oracle’s proposal requests a ban on the use of “information not readily available to the general public” (*id.* at 2), such as “proprietary databases (such as private investigator databases) and other investigative tactics commonly used to conduct juror research” (*id.* at 7). The boundaries of what Oracle means by “readily available to the general public,” “proprietary databases” or “other investigative tactics” in its proposed ban are unclear. However, to the extent that Oracle’s proposal seeks to preclude the use of subscription-based databases that

1 allow searching of public records, Google would not object in this case to such a ban should the  
 2 Court so order.

## 3 **II. RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S INQUIRIES RE "SEARCH STRATEGIES"**

4 Google hereby provides the following answers to the Court's specific inquiries regarding  
 5 "search strategies" that it would employ "assuming, *arguendo*, that some Internet searches about  
 6 prospective jurors is allowed." ECF No. 1531 at 1.

7 **Question #1:**

8 Do references to the "general public" include individuals who are logged in to a  
 9 particular site or application although not connected to a prospective juror? That is,  
 10 a member of the general public who does not have a Twitter account could not  
 11 view the followers or the followed list of a prospective juror's account, even if that  
 12 juror's profile is public. An individual who is logged into his Twitter account,  
 13 however, could view those lists, even without connecting to the prospective juror.  
 14 Do you contemplate conducting searches and viewing prospective jurors' profiles  
 15 with logged in users?

16 **Google's Response to Question #1**

17 According to the guidance set forth by American Bar Association, an attorney, or an  
 18 employee or investigator assisting the attorney in jury selection, may conduct a "[p]assive review  
 19 of a juror's website or ESM, *that is available without making an access request*, and of which the  
 20 juror is unaware." ABA Formal Opinion 466 at 4 (emphasis added). Thus, to use the Court's  
 21 example, if the information on a prospective juror's Twitter page (*i.e.*, the "followers or the  
 22 followed list") remains publicly available to any user logged in to Twitter (without the user  
 23 needing to request access to the information from the juror), the logged-in user may passively  
 24 review that information on juror's Twitter page without raising ethical concerns. ABA Formal  
 25 Opinion 466 at 4 ("In the world outside the Internet, a lawyer or another acting on the lawyer's  
 26 behalf, would not be engaging in an improper *ex parte* contact with a prospective juror by driving  
 27 down the street where the prospective juror lives to observe the environs in order to glean  
 28 publicly available information that could inform the lawyer's jury-selection decisions.").

29 **Question #2:**

30 Oracle refers to "information that is available under the user's privacy settings."  
 31 Who is the "user" in that circumstance?

1           Google's Response to Question #2

2           Google understands Oracle's reference to "privacy settings" in this context to be the  
 3 privacy settings on the prospective juror's social media account. As the ABA Opinion states,  
 4 "[p]rivacy settings allow the ESM subscriber to establish different degrees of protection for  
 5 different categories of information, each of which can require specific permission to access."  
 6 ABA Formal Opinion 466 at 4. To the extent a prospective user's privacy settings require an  
 7 "access request"—e.g. a "friend request" on Facebook—to view certain information, that  
 8 information would be beyond the scope of passive reviewed allowed under the ABA Opinion.  
 9 ABA Formal Opinion 466 at 4.

10          Question #3:

11          Oracle states that neither side should be permitted "to review Google, Yahoo!,  
 12 and/or other Internet searches." Please state how you intend to discover  
 prospective jurors' social media profiles without reviewing "Internet searches."

13          Google's Response to Question #3

14          Google understands Oracle's reference to "Internet searches" in this context to be  
 15 referring to a prospective juror's Internet search history. Because an individual's search history  
 16 information is not publicly available on the Internet, Google understands that neither party has  
 17 proposed having the ability to review proprietary, non-public information about a particular  
 18 juror's search history.

19          Question #4:

20          Please state whether you intend to use dating sites or applications in investigating  
 21 prospective jurors.

22          Google's Response to Question #4

23          Google does not intend to use dating sites or applications in investigating prospective  
 24 jurors.

25          Question #5:

26          Please state whether you intend to use technical search tools such as "reverse  
 27 whois" or to review materials that a prospective juror may not have realized could  
 28 be accessed by the public, such as source code for a website.

1       Google's Response to Question #5

2           Google does not intend to use a “reverse whois” tool or review source code for websites in  
3 investigating prospective jurors. Google is unsure what else the Court may be including in the  
4 category of “technical search tools,” but, as stated above, Google does not intend to use  
5 proprietary or non-public information to access information about a juror’s Internet search  
6 history.

7

8           Dated: March 9, 2016

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

9

10          By: /s/ Robert A. Van Nest  
11           ROBERT A. VAN NEST  
12           CHRISTA M. ANDERSON  
13           DANIEL PURCELL

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Atorneys for Defendant  
GOOGLE INC.